REMARKS

[0002]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 13, 15-16, 18-19, and 26-31 and 41-45 are currently pending

- Claims 14, 17 and 32 are canceled herein

- Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 26 and 28-31 are amended herein

- New claims 41-45 are added herein

[0003]   Support for the amendments to claims 1-3, 5, 11, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 26 and 28-31 is found in the specification at least at Pages 18-19 and 25-28.

[0004]   Furthermore, new claims 41-45 are fully supported by the Application, and therefore do not constitute new matter. Support for these new claims is found in the specification at least at Pages 3, 18-19, 23 and 25-28.

[0005]   New claims 41-45 are allowable over the cited documents of record at least because they recite features that are not taught or suggested by the cited documents.

Specification Objections

[0006]   The Specification stands objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, namely "computer readable storage medium." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the objection and the basis for the objection.

[0007]   The Applicant submits that the plain meaning of the term "computer readable storage medium" is understood by a person having ordinary skill in the art. In

accordance with MPEP 2111.01 and the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals in *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and *Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 1371, 1372, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004), the plain meaning of a claim term "must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification."

[0008]   Since the Examiner has not asserted that specification is inconsistent with a plain meaning "computer readable storage medium," it appears there is no evidence to indicate that the term be given anything other than its plain meaning as understood by a person having ordinary skill in the art.   Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

Cited Documents

[0009]   The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Paroz: Paroz, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,125

- Beged-Dov: Beged-Dov, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,983,328

- Brewer: Brewer, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,786,818

- Deshpande: Deshpande, U.S. Patent No. 7,171,444

- Kawamura: Kawamura, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,662,207

Claims 1-3, 5, 13-18, 26, and 28-31 Are Non-Obvious Over Paroz in view of Beged-Dov and further in view of Brewer

[00010] Claims 1-3, 5, 13-18, 26, and 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Paroz in view of Beged-Dov and further in view of Brewer. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[00010] Applicant submits that the Office cannot make a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 1, as amended, is unpatentable in view of the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer. Applicant submits that the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- o a local agent component configured to:
  - receive local input device data from one or more local input devices of a local system;
  - route the local input device data to a remote system for control thereof with the one or more local input devices;
  - switch the local input device data to the remote system upon detecting a motion of a user interface pointer associated with a switching area on a user interface of the local system; and
  - transmit content from a local clipboard at the local system to a remote clipboard at the remote system upon detecting that the content has been copied to the local clipboard, wherein:
    - **a location of the switching area on the user interface of the local system is determined based on a physical location of the remote system relative to a physical location of the local system; and**

- **the motion of the user interface pointer associated with the switching area is selected from the group consisting of: placing the user interface pointer within the switching area, moving the user interface pointer in a particular direction within the switching area, moving the user interface pointer within a particular speed range within the switching area, and combinations thereof**

[0011]   Claim 1 recites in part that "a location of the switching area on the user interface of the local system is determined based on a physical location of the remote system relative to a physical location of the local system." This feature is similar to a feature recited in claim 16 where the Office cites Column 2, Lines 35-37 and Column 4, Line 66 – Column 5, Line 21 of Brewer as teaching this feature. (*See* Pages 9-10 of the Action) Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0012]   The cited portion of Brewer merely describes that "a process which interprets position data received for a mouse pointer is used to set focus and minimize the need for clicking." This cited portion or elsewhere in Brewer fails to teach or suggest that "a location of the switching area on the user interface of the local system is determined based on *a physical location of the remote system relative to a physical location of the local system*" as currently recited in the claim (with emphasis added). More specifically, Brewer does not describe determining "a location of the switching area ... based on a physical location of the remote system relative to a physical location of the local system" as recited in claim 1.

[0013]   Furthermore, Paroz, Beged-Dov, and Brewer, either taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest to "switch the local input device data to the remote system upon detecting a motion of a user interface pointer associated with a switching area on a user interface of the local system" with "the motion of the user interface pointer associated with the switching area" being "*selected from the group consisting of: placing the user interface pointer within the switching area, moving the user interface pointer in a particular direction within the switching area, moving the user interface pointer within a particular speed range within the switching area, and combinations thereof*" as recited in this claim (with emphasis added). None of the cited documents teach or suggest this feature.

[0014]   Consequently, the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 5

[0015]   Claims 2-3 and 5 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-3 and 5 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 13

[0016]   Applicant submits that the Office cannot make a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 13 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer. Applicant submits that the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- o a first agent programmed on the first computing system that receives local input device data from a local input device; and
- o a second agent of the second computing system that communicates with the first agent to facilitate control of the second computing system, the local input device triggers routing of the local input device data by the first agent to the second agent based on a motion of a pointer associated with a switching area on a user interface of the first computing system, wherein:
  - ▪ **the motion of the pointer associated with the switching area is selected from the group consisting of: placing the pointer within the switching area, moving the pointer in a particular direction within the switching area, moving the pointer within a particular speed range within the switching area, and combinations thereof**; and
  - ▪ the first agent transmits clipboard information copied from the first computing system to the second agent to facilitate sharing of clipboard data between the first and second computing systems

[0017]   Claim 13 recites in part that "the motion of the pointer associated with the switching area is selected from the group consisting of: placing the pointer within the switching area, moving the pointer in a particular direction within the switching area,

moving the pointer within a particular speed range within the switching area, and combinations thereo." Similar to the discussion above with respect to claim 1, this feature is not taught or suggested by Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer.

[0018]   Consequently, the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 14-18

[0019]   Claims 14 and 17 are canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Therefore, the rejections thereto are rendered moot. Claims 15, 16 and 18 ultimately depend from independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 15, 16 and 18 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 26

[0020]   Applicant submits that the Office cannot make a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 26 is unpatentable in view of the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer. Applicant submits that the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- o employing a processor executing computer-executable instructions stored on a computer-readable storage medium to implement acts comprising:
  - receiving input device data associated with a local input device of a first computing system
  - **designating at least one switching location within a user interface of the first computing system, wherein the at least one switching location is determined based on a physical location of a second computing system relative to the first computing system such that the at least one switching location is created near or in a direction of the physical location of the second computing system;**
  - determining whether a location of a user interface pointer coincides with the at least one switching location;
  - routing the input device data to the second computing system upon determining that the location of the user interface pointer coincides with the at least one switching location;
  - determining that content at the first computing system has been copied to a local clipboard; and
  - transmitting the content from the local clipboard to a remote clipboard of the second computing system upon detecting that the content has been copied to the local clipboard

[0021]   Claim 26 recites in part "designating at least one switching location within a user interface of the first computing system, wherein the at least one switching location is determined based on a physical location of a second computing system relative to the first computing system such that the at least one switching location is created near or in a direction of the physical location of the second computing system." Similar to the discussion above with respect to claim 1, the cited documents fail to teach or suggest this feature. Furthermore, the cited documents does not teach or suggest that "the at

Serial No.: 10/750,028
Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4548US
Atty/Agent: Kasey C. Christie
-20-
lee&hayes The Business of IP®
www.leehayes.com • 509 324 9256

least one switching location is determined based on a physical location of a second computing system relative to the first computing system *such that the at least one switching location is created near or in a direction of the physical location of the second computing system*" as currently recited in this claim (with emphasis added).

[0022] Consequently, the combination of Paroz, Beged-Dov and Brewer does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 28-31

[0023] Claims 28-31 ultimately depend from independent claim 26. As discussed above, claim 26 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 28-31 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

[0024] For example, claim 28 recites "tracking a physical location of the second computing system such that placement of the second computing system within a working area of the first computing system causes the first agent to automatically designate the at least one switching location within the user interface of the first computing system for control of the second computing system." The Office asserts that Column 9 Lines 21-25 and Column 9 Lines 39-44 of Paroz teach this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0025] The cited portion of Paroz merely describes providing a response (e.g., generating a message) upon receiving an event from a local program. This cited

portion of Paroz however fails to teach or suggest "tracking a physical location of the second computing system such that placement of the second computing system within a working area of the first computing system causes the first agent to automatically designate the at least one switching location within the user interface of the first computing system for control of the second computing system" as currently recited in claim 28.

[0026]   Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 27 Are Non-Obvious Over Paroz-"Beged-Dov"-Brewer in view of Deshpande

[0027]   Claims 11 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Paroz-"Beged-Dov"-Brewer in view of Deshpande. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 11 and 27

[0028]   Claims 11 and 27 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 26 respectively. As discussed above, claims 1 and 26 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 11 and 27 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from allowable base claims. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

[0029]   For example, none of the cited documents teach or suggest that "the local agent component is further configured to emulate, on the local system, a touch pad

interface derived from a user interface of the remote system to control the remote system", and "the touch pad interface displays only control objects of the remote system, and space in the user interface of the remote system that provides no meaningful function or purpose related to interacting with the local system is eliminated" as currently recited in claim 11. Specifically, none of the cited documents describe to "emulate ... a touch pad interface" and have "the touch pad interface display only control objects of the remote system" while "space in the user interface of the remote system that provides no meaningful function or purpose related to interacting with the local system is eliminated."

[0030]   Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 32 Are Non-Obvious Over Paroz-"Beged-Dov"-Brewer and further in view of Kawamura

[0031]   Claims 19 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Paroz-"Beged-Dov"-Brewer and further in view of Kawamura. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 19

[0032]   Claim 19 ultimately depends from independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 19 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an

allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Dependent Claim 32

[0033]   Claim 32 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Therefore, the rejection thereto is rendered moot.

New Claims 41-45

[0034]   Claims 41-45 are added herein. Claim 41 is an independent claim with claims 42-45 depend from claim 41. Claim 41 recites in part that "a location of the first switching area on the user interface of the local system is determined based on a physical location of the remote system relative to a physical location of the local system such that the location of the first switching area is created near or in a direction of the physical location of the remote system" and "the motion of the first user interface pointer associated with the first switching area is selected from the group consisting of: placing the first user interface pointer within the first switching area, moving the first user interface pointer in a particular direction within the first switching area, moving the first user interface pointer within a particular speed range within the first switching area, and combinations thereof." Similar to the discussions above with respect to independent claims 1, 13 and 26, these features are allowable at least over the cited documents of record.

Conclusion

[0035] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/kaseychristie40559/   Dated:___08/04/2009

Kasey C. Christie (kasey@leehayes.com; 509-944-4732)
Registration No. 40559